

## **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 26, 28, and 30-32, and have cancelled claims 2-24, during prosecution of this patent application. Applicants are not conceding in this patent application that the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, since the claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the subject matter encompassed by said amended and cancelled claims, and to pursue other claims, in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

In a telephonic interview on June 10, 2011 between Examiner Namitha Pillai and Applicants' Representative Jack P. Friedman, possible claim amendments that may overcome the present prior art claim rejections were discussed, including reciting that the display sets are sets of slides.

The addition of the text of "Each set of displays may be a display set that includes a set of slides." in the amendment of the specification is supported in FIG. 6 which includes the text of "Slide Set Category Title".

In the Advisory Action mailed June 13, 2011, the Examiner states: "Applicant is requested to point to where in the specification there is a clear disclosure of the physically tangible storage device and examples of these physically tangible storage devices". In response, Applicants point to the specification, page 11, lines 3-4 ("program modules may be located in both local and remote memory storage devices") and page 11, lines 22-31 (discussion of storage

device 25 depicted as physically tangible in FIG. 2) and page 12, line 30 (indicating a “disk drive” which is an example of a physically tangible storage device).

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,842,185 B1 (Mavrommati et al.), herein referred to Mavrommati and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0049763 (Seamon).

Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a): Claims 1 and 25-32**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,842,185 B1 (Mavrommati et al.), herein referred to Mavrommati and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0049763 (Seamon).

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1, 26, and 28 are not unpatentable over Mavrommati and Seamon, because Mavrommati and Seamon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 26, and 28.

A first example of why claims 1, 26, and 28 are not unpatentable over Mavrommati and Seamon is that Mavrommati and Seamon does not teach or suggest the feature:

“responsive to selection of a directory of the simultaneously displayed directories and to a navigation along a displayed subdirectory path through the hierarchy of subdirectories to which the selected directory is linked such that the navigation ends with selection of a last subdirectory of the subdirectory path, simultaneously displaying on the display screen display categories, each display category being displayed and identified as text consisting of a title of a corresponding subdirectory of the last subdirectory, each display category comprising display sets, each display set including a set of slides;

responsive to selection of a display category of the simultaneously displayed display categories, displaying a first row of buttons in a viewing screen for the selected display category, wherein each button in the first row of buttons corresponds to a different display set of the display sets in the selected display category such that each display set is represented by a different button in the first row of buttons;

responsive to selection of a first button in the first row of buttons, displaying in the viewing screen a second row of buttons simultaneous with the displayed first row of buttons, wherein each button in the second row of buttons corresponds to a different slide of the set of slides in the display set selected via selection of the first button in the first row of buttons;

responsive to selection of a second button in the second row of buttons corresponding to the selected first button, displaying in the viewing screen the slide corresponding to the selected second button simultaneous with the displayed first row of buttons and the displayed second row of buttons”.

The Examiner argues: “Seamon discloses responsive to selection of a directory of the simultaneously displayed directories and to a navigation along a displayed subdirectory path through the hierarchy of subdirectories to which the selected directory is linked such that the navigation ends with selection of a last subdirectory of the subdirectory path (page 2, paragraph 31). Seamon discloses simultaneously displaying on the display screen display categories, each display category being displayed and identified as text consisting of a title of a corresponding subdirectory of the last subdirectory, each display category comprising display sets (Figure 9B). Seamon discloses responsive to selection of a display category of the simultaneously displayed display categories, displaying a viewing screen of the for the selected display category, the viewing screen comprising a first row of buttons and a second row of buttons (Figure 9C). Seamon discloses each button in the first row of buttons corresponding to a different display set of the display sets in the selected category such that each display set is represented by a different button in the first row of buttons, each button in the second row of buttons corresponding to a graphical display in a display set selected via selection of a button in the first row of buttons

(page 4, paragraph 54). Seamon discloses the first row of buttons and second row of buttons being simultaneously displayed in the viewing screen and responsive to selection of a first button in the first row of buttons and selection of a second button in the second row of buttons corresponding to the selected first button, displaying in the viewing screen a graphical display corresponding to the selected second button (page 4, paragraph 55).”

The preceding argument by the Examiner is based on Seamon, FIGS. 9A- 9C. However, the telephonic interview on June 10, 2011 between Examiner Namitha Pillai and Applicant’s Representative Jack P. Friedman (discussed *supra*) found Seamon, FIG. 9D to also be relevant to the analysis of claims 1, 26, and 28. Therefore, Applicants next analyze Seamon, FIGS. 9A-9D with respect to the preceding claimed feature.

Applicants respectfully contend that in Seamon, the claimed subdirectory path is represented by “Cars” (within 140 of Seamon, FIG. 9A) --> ”Ford” (146 in Seamon, FIG. 9B) --> 150 in Seamon, FIG. 9C). Thus, the claimed “last subdirectory” of the subdirectory path is 150 in Seamon, FIG. 9D. The claimed “selected display category” is “Taurus” 154 within the “last subdirectory” 150 in Seamon, FIG. 9C. The claimed “viewing screen” is represented by 156 in Seamon, FIG. 9D. The claimed “first row of buttons” is represented by the vertical column of “Ford : Taurus” in the viewing screen 156 in Seamon, FIG. 9D.

Given the preceding representation in Seamon of claimed entities, Applicants respectfully contend that Seamon does not disclose “responsive to selection of a first button in the first row of buttons, displaying in the viewing screen a second row of buttons *simultaneous* with the displayed first row of buttons, wherein each button in the second row of buttons corresponds to a

different slide of the set of slides in the display set selected via selection of the first button in the first row of buttons” (emphasis added).

Applicants assert that if any of the “Ford : Taurus” buttons (i.e., a “first button”) in the viewing screen 156 in Seamon, FIG. 9D is selected, the only entity responsively displayed is “the picture” as recited to the left of the “Ford : Taurus” buttons. In particular, Seamon does not disclose a second row of buttons being generated (in response to the selection of the first button) such that “each button in the second row of buttons corresponds to a different slide of the set of slides in the display set selected via selection of the first button”. In fact, Seamon is totally silent as to slides.

In addition, the display screen 156 in Seamon, 9D does not depict a *simultaneous* display of the first row of buttons ( “Ford : Taurus”) and the (non-existent) second row of buttons.

Therefore, Mavrommati and Seamon does not disclose the preceding feature of claims 1, 26, and 28.

In addition, Applicants respectfully contend that Seamon does not disclose “responsive to selection of a second button in the second row of buttons corresponding to the selected first button, displaying in the viewing screen the slide corresponding to the selected second button simultaneous with the displayed first row of buttons and the displayed second row of buttons”.

As explained *supra*, the claimed “second row of buttons” does not exist in the viewing screen 156 in Seamon, FIG. 9D, and most certainly is not displayed simultaneously with the first row of buttons. Thus, Seamon does not disclose “selection of a second button in the second row of buttons corresponding to the selected first button”. Likewise, Seamon does not depict in the viewing screen 156, a responsive display of the slide corresponding to the selected second button

simultaneous with the displayed first row of buttons and the displayed second row of buttons as claimed.

Therefore, Mavrommati and Seamon does not disclose the preceding feature of claims 1, 26, and 28.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1, 26, and 28 are not unpatentable over Mavrommati and Seamon, and that claims 1, 26, and 28 are in condition for allowance. Since claim 25 depends from claim 1, Applicants contend that claim 25 is likewise in condition for allowance. Since claim 27 depends from claim 26, Applicants contend that claim 27 is likewise in condition for allowance. Since claim 29 depends from claim 28, Applicants contend that claim 29 is likewise in condition for allowance.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457 (IBM). The Attorney's reference number for this case is END-9500.

Dated: August 23, 2011

/Jack P. Friedman/  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Customer No. 30449  
Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
22 Century Hill Drive, Suite 302  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850 Telephone  
(518) 220-1857 Facsimile  
E-mail: jfriedman@iplawusa.com